Vol. X, No. 13 HUMAN EVENTS April 1, 1953

A TRAGIC TALE OF LEND-LEASE

By Richard L. Stokes

APR 9 53

From within the Kremlin flashes a revealing new sidelight, hitherto unpublished, upon the tragic tale of Lend-Lease for Russia. The informant is Colonel Igor Bogolepov, Counselor to the Soviet Foreign Office before he escaped from Russia. During April of last year, Colonel Bogolepov testified before the McCarran Subcommittee that he had become an employee, here and abroad, of the United States Government. The gist of his story is as follows.

Late in July, 1941, the account begins, Moscow learned that President Roosevelt was sending Harry L. Hopkins for Lend-Lease negotiations with Premier Stalin. The name was a surprise. Not many Red officials had ever heard of their future benefactor. A wireless, asking who Harry L. Hopkins was, went to Ambassador Constantine Oumansky in Washington. His reply was limited to generalities that might have been copied from *Who's Who*. The envoy was admonished to get details about Hopkins' political temper and attitude towards the U.S.S.R.

It was taken as a matter of course in Moscow, Bogolepov proceeds, that Hopkins would bring heavy demands for concessions and guarantees (which were expected to be colossal) in return for Lend-Lease favors. Above all, Oumansky was ordered to procure an authentic list of exactions which the President's representative would seek to impose. While awaiting an answer, the Foreign Office appointed a committee to draft the maximum *quid pro quo* which Russia, if pushed, would be ready to yield.

That the "bargaining" was expected to be drastic seems obvious from the committee's composition. The chairman was Foreign Minister Vyacheslav M. Molotov. The deputy chairman, Anastas I. Mikoyan, was slated to act as Commissar for Lend-Lease. The others were top-flight experts — Lieutenant General Alexander M. Vassilensky, until recently Minister of Defense, with the rank of Marshal; Professor Ilya P. Trainin, Russia's foremost law authority; and Colonel Bogolepov himself, as political and legal adviser to the Foreign Office.

Toiling with speed, the committee held a number of sessions and came up with a directive prescribing how far diplomatic traders with Hopkins would be empowered to go. This memorandum is a poignant souvenir from the land of "Might Have Been" — even admitting that the Kremlin would doubtless have tried to elude its promises. At any rate, the Soviet Government was prepared, in case of necessity, to sign an agreement to do the following things:

(1) Arrange for strict American inspection of the use to which Lend-Lease supplies were put. (2) Admit American military observers into the Soviet lines, such as specialists in aviation, armor, artillery and chemical warfare. (3) Grant mining concessions for manganese ore, in the United States a scarce and strategic metal. (4) Open up special privileges for Americans in the Baku and Volga oil fields. (5) Invite American capital to participate in the development of Siberia's resources. (6) Vow a solemn pledge to maintain freedom of speech, freedom of political parties and freedom of religion.

Hopkins arrived in Moscow on July 30. But a day or so earlier the usually dour Molotov had saluted his colleagues with one of his infrequent broad grins. The committee was adjourned, he said, and its formula would be shelved. The Minister explained that he now had a full report on Harry L. Hopkins. It was based, Molotov declared, on intelligence supplied by "a certain man at the very highest level of the Roosevelt administration". The name was concealed. Bogolepov gathered it was that of an American spy for Russia either in the State Department or in Mr. Roosevelt's entourage at the White House. The information was impeccable, what-

Copyright 1953 by Human Events, Inc.
Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ever that agent's identity. With an assurance justified by the event, Molotov announced: "Mr. Hopkins will demand no concessions whatever. His desire is to ask nothing and give everything. What he wants is to keep us in the fighting — and that is all. Mr. Hopkins is completely on our side and may be trusted absolutely."

Molotov's prediction inevitably brings to mind the famous utterance with which Mr. Roosevelt confounded his one time Ambassador to Moscow, William C. Bullitt. This is the key document of the Russo-American entente and the arch clue to Hopkins' pro-Soviet labors in this country and at Moscow, Teheran and Yalta. It ranks among the deadlier frivolities of chiefs of state. It can scarcely be quoted too often. Mr. Bullitt had protested, on the basis of three years spent in the Soviet capital, that our Russian policy was sure to fail and that Stalin could not be trusted.

"Bill, I don't dispute your facts", Mr. Roosevelt said. "They are accurate. I don't dispute the logic of your reasoning. I just have a hunch that Stalin is not that kind of man. Harry says he's not, and that he doesn't want anything but security for his country. And I think that if I give him anything I can and ask nothing from him in return, *noblesse oblige,* he won't try to annex anything and will work with me for a world of peace and democracy." (Quoted by Bullitt in his article "The Lost Peace" in *Life,* August 23, 1948.)

PERHAPS MR. ROOSEVELT'S fundamental error was his pledge to bring about the military annihilation of Germany and Japan. This meant smashing the dams which for generations, in Europe and Asia, had effectively contained Tsarist and Bolshevik expansions. The certain consequence was a power vacuum which the Soviet Union could occupy at will. The President's one escape was to make himself believe, against all evidence, that the Communist tyranny was actually a peace-loving democracy and would relinquish voluntarily this epochal chance to fulfill Russia's age-old aspirations. It is small wonder that Mr. Roosevelt was haunted now and then by qualms over his preposterous gamble. Reassurance was supplied by Hopkins with conviction and gusto. The thankful President embraced him as an infallible expert on Russia, and would listen to no one else. The vassal of a policy became its grand vizier.

Testimony as to the influence which Hopkins came to exert upon Mr. Roosevelt has been offered lately by Major General John R. Deane, chief of the U.S. Military Mission to Moscow during the war. Some years ago General Deane accused Hopkins of administering Russian Lend-Lease "with a zeal approaching fanaticism". Today he is a sturdy champion of Hopkins' loyalty and patriotism. Trebly damaging, because of his partisanship, is an allegation which General Deane felt obliged to publish in last December's *American Mercury:* "There can be no doubt that the attitude of the President was reflected throughout the government, and there can be no doubt that his confidant, Harry Hopkins, encouraged the President in this attitude."

General Deane added that our leadership during World War II was "gullible and stupid in its relations with the Soviet Union"; that it seems incredible we should have been taken in so completely by Stalin and his lieutenants; and that American interests suffered, while those of Russia gained, because "Hopkins went too far both as to priorities and in interpreting the Lend-Lease law".

A sample of how servant "encouraged" master was revealed by Hopkins at a press conference following one of his visits to Stalin. As a result, the thinking of not a few Washington correspondents was misled for years. From the dictator's own mouth he brought the true evangel. The Russian people, he quoted Stalin as saying, had proved themselves in the war to deserve a higher standard of living. To the achievement of that goal he had dedicated the remainder of his life. The job was so vast, Hopkins argued triumphantly, that Stalin's hands would be too full for exterior adventures.

It may be, as General Deane asserts, that Hopkins was a loyal patriot. It may be argued also that he wore his patriotism with a difference. His true and only fidelity appears to have been given to the friend in the White House who raised him from a humble social worker to the peer of mightiest men. "I love F.D.R.", he acknowledged to Free Poland's last Ambassador to Washington, Jan Ciechanowski. Out of love partly, but with the jaunty approval of his own

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

conscience, Hopkins plunged into the chimera obsessing his chief.

Mutually interacting, the President and his Pythias generated a pestilence of infatuation which not only spread throughout the Federal establishment, as General Deane observes, but contaminated public opinion as a whole. The central plague spot was the White House. Its germinal culture proliferated in the devious, amoral psyche of Franklin D. Roosevelt, whom biography may judge to have been a complex of ignorance, perfidy and egomania. That is, if he was not captive all the while of some international intrigue for rooting out Western civilization.

ACCORDING TO PROFESSOR Arnold J. Toynbee, the non-West, led by the Soviet Union, found it possible in 1945, for the first time in half a millenium, to launch a counteroffensive against the West. This global reverse was due to weapons and technologies which the West alone had genius to invent but which it was mad enough to put at non-West disposal. In that case, Franklin Delano Roosevelt and Harry Lloyd Hopkins would stand unparalleled in history for the profusion of their gifts to that barbaric revolution. Thanks to them, in no small degree, Western culture now faces its most ominous hazard since the fall of Constantinople.

For most Russians, in the summer of 1941, Hopkins was a stranger whose advent was looked upon with suspicion and dread. At the Teheran Conference, two years and four months later, when he met Stalin for a second time, the scene had shifted dramatically. The autocrat of all the Russians plied his American favorite with blandishments reserved for notable contributors to Communist empire. Others beside Hopkins were dupes of the show of frankness and benevolence staged by the Politburo's most artful performer. "In greeting Hopkins at Teheran", rejoiced Ambassador Harriman, "Stalin displayed more open and warm cordiality than he had ever been known to show to any foreigner." Mr. Roosevelt was enchanted. To Ciechanowski he exclaimed: "Harry gets on with Stalin like a house afire. In fact, they seem to have become buddies!"

The power to help Stalin which Hopkins amassed is beyond popular conception even today. He entrenched himself in a fortress commanding all approaches to Soviet affairs, diplomatic, military and economic. Many of the strongest gates were staffed by his personal appointees. Among his protegés was Charles E. Bohlen, recently appointed by the Eisenhower regime as Ambassador to Russia.

Lend-Lease policy was always made at the White House, and to Hopkins the President delegated most of the authority. That authority was consolidated through his tenure of the chairmanships of two overriding units — the Munitions Assignment Board and the President's Soviet Protocol Committee. With respect to the former, witnesses relate, it was the chairman's habit to rush into board meetings at the last moment and brusquely order that *materiel* already allotted elsewhere should be diverted to the Soviet Union. Interventions of the kind were so frequent that they came to be regarded as almost unvarying.

It is revealed in *Strange Alliance,* General Deane's book, that Commissar Mikoyan, secure of White House backing, constantly overruled Ambassador Harriman and General Deane. Mr. Roosevelt himself forbade Americans in Russia to attempt supervision of its employment of Lend-Lease supplies. U. S. Army officers assigned to the Russian movement in this country were bullied into submission by Soviet opposites with menaces of Hopkins' displeasure. A volunteer in both World Wars, Major George Racey Jordan was forced out of the service because of his struggle to safeguard national interests at Great Falls, Mont.

It has been established from official documents that Lend-Lease, a Hopkins dependency, engineered shipments to Moscow of many tons of written and photographic data on American industrial know-how, and of uranium chemicals with a potential of more than enough fissionable U-235 to trigger a nuclear explosion and almost enough to power a workable chain reaction pile. Shown to have been implicated with Lend-Lease in breaches of security were the Board of Economic Warfare, Army Ordnance, the Procurement Division of the Treasury and the Department of Commerce. Access to the files of the Lend-Lease and Foreign Economic Administra-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tions, and of the Soviet Protocol Committee, was denied to Congressional investigators by the State Department.

By a violent wrench, diplomatic immunity was stretched from the Soviet Embassy to include the Soviet Government Purchasing Commission. Sworn charges by Major Jordan, which have not been refuted, allege that Hopkins took a personal hand in promoting uranium shipments to Moscow and conveying secret data on the technique of nuclear fission. Obviously for postwar rather than defense purposes, Lend-Lease dispatched to Russia vast quantities of materials, hosts of machines and entire industrial plants. This was at a time when spies for the Soviet Union, on American soil, were gnawing at the foundations of its ally and benefactor, the United States. Such enemy agents were shielded from the FBI by the State Department, which took orders from the White House.

The paradox of the foregoing is that Mr. Roosevelt and Hopkins were not Communists or even fellow-travellers. They knew little and cared less about Communism as such. If they ever gave a thought to Marxist dogma, it was likely one of contempt. For Robert E. Sherwood, the official Hopkins biographer, his hero, despite a flippant air, was at heart a reformer and romanticist.

Ambassador Ciechanowski, author of *Defeat in Victory,* had cause to study this alarming American with realistic eyes. He diagnosed Hopkins as a thorough-paced cynic, whose scornful candor was totally uninhibited. In a fascination of horror the Polish diplomat watched while Mr. Roosevelt and Hopkins airily juggled the fate of many peoples, including his own. From his background of experience they seemed all but illiterate as to the actualities of Communism and of the nations then at their mercy. His protests, though desperate and sound, were indulgently smiled off.

LESS THAN a decade later, Washington was making every possible use of the knowledge of a former Soviet official, Igor Bogolepov. The son of a bourgeois father, now dead, who was a member of the Soviet Academy of Science, he became a reserve staff officer of the Red Army, with the rank of Colonel, and a functionary at the Foreign Office. In 1939 he enrolled as a "candidate" for the Communist Party, though he was never a full member. His purpose, he explains, was to qualify himself for political as well as legal work, with the hope of sabotaging the party from within.

Late in 1937 Bogolepov was ordered to join the Soviet staff on the Barcelona front in Spain. After a few weeks most of the principal officers, including himself, were arrested by special commissioners from Moscow and sent home to stand trial on charges of "Trotzkyism" and "pro-Franco deviations". He awaited sentence for many months in the Lubianka political prison. One afternoon he was freed and reinstated without prejudice at the Foreign Office. Those responsible for the arrests in Spain had themselves been seized and put to death.

After taking part in the defense of Leningrad, Bogolepov joined his close friend, Lieutenant General Andrei A. Vlassov, in an escape to the Nazi lines. Their plan was to enlist armies, among hordes of Soviet war prisoners in Germany, to fight against the Russian Communist regime. There was prolonged delay, but at last three divisions of 45,000 men were equipped.

Before they got into action, Yank forces overran southern Germany. For the second time in four years Russians made the same blunder. In 1941 they had greeted the Nazis as liberators and were slaughtered; and now, bearing flowers, Vlassov's divisions marched forth in 1945 to welcome American crusaders for freedom. Promptly, under the Yalta pact, the credulous Slavs were rounded up by U.S. troops and turned over to the Soviet Union, where they vanished without trace. General Vlassov's body, skewered on a meat hook, was exhibited in Moscow's Red Square.

By lucky chance, Bogolepov had been absent on a mission, and was able to hide himself from the Americans on a Bavarian farm. Not for two years did he venture to "surface". By then Washington had realized the crime of using its soldiers as procurers for Stalin's murder tunnels.

Richard L. Stokes, newspaper reporter; drama and music critic; Washington and war correspondent; author of a life of Leon Blum and several dramatic pieces.

ADDITIONAL COPIES: One—$.20; six—1.00; ten—1.50; fifty—5.50; one hundred—10.00. Quotations for larger quantities on request.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HUMAN EVENTS

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor* FRANK CHODOROV, *Associate Editor*

Vol. X, No. 13 Wednesday, April 1, 1953 Washington, D. C.

APR 9 '53

Republican New Deal? When the Senate confirmed Bohlen as Ambassador to Russia, the left-wing Democratic Senator Murray (Montana) summed it up as a "victory for Truman and Acheson". Not only the baker's dozen who voted against, but a score or more of GOP Senators who "held their noses" and voted for confirmation literally writhed under what they privately admitted was an accurate evaluation by Sen. Murray. In the last forty-eight hours, observers came to a quick conclusion that a crisis within the Republican party impends. A succession of developments reinforced this impression.

(1) The mail to many Senators ran 95 per cent against the Eisenhower Administration's support of Bohlen. The head of the GOP state committee in one Midwestern state remarked that if Ike were running in that state today he would be defeated.

(2) A startling development suggests a possible eclipse of Senator Taft as a leader of the Republican right-wing. One member of Congress convincingly tells us that in his "tremendous" mail from people all over the country as well as constituents, expressions of criticism about Senator Taft abound. He estimated that 40 per cent of the mail contained anti-Taft sentiments.

As for former supporters of Taft in the Congress, reactions to the Ohioan range from sadness to outright anger. One prominent Senator, who fought for Taft's nomination at the convention, remarked — rather shouted — to us: "Taft — you can have him!"

(3) The GOP mood in the lobbies of the two Houses is gloomy. Members feel that, on tax reduction, cuts in appropriations, foreign policy and many other issues, the White House is trying to force on them what they call "a Republican New Deal".

(4) There was a flare-up at last week's White House meeting between Congressional leaders and the President who was attended by his "Assistant President", former Governor Sherman Adams. A sharp exchange took place over failure to clear executive appointments with members of Congress. Mr. Adams did not fare well.

Some members of Congress believe that Mr. Adams no longer cares whether the Republicans will win the House and Senate next year. According to this view, Adams believes that Eisenhower can rise above party and "get along with" a Democratic Congress. He figures that on domestic matters, the old voting bloc of conservatives, Southern Democrats and Western Republicans, will back the Administration's conservative domestic measures. On foreign policy, the Democrats plus the Eastern GOP "liberals" will prove sufficient to put over measures of a Truman-Acheson variety.

GOP National Committee: Speaker of the House Joseph Martin has already fired the opening gun in what may prove a big battle next week when the Republican National Committee meets in Washington to elect a new Chairman (to succeed Wesley Roberts, casualty because of an internecine GOP feud in Kansas). Joe Martin last Saturday in New York called for the election of former Representative Leonard Hall of New York, now a Surrogate judge. The Martin proposal came as an explosion, because it is known that Hall for some time has been at odds with Governor Dewey. Martin said: "I am going to do everything to make him (Hall) Chairman."

Apart from the profound effects of such a selection as a rebuff to Dewey, there is another reason cited by Washington observers as important. Hall served as Chairman of the Republican Congressional

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1953 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Committee and helped build that group into a highly efficient organization to assist GOP Congressmen and candidates for House seats. In short, Hall as Chairman would lay emphasis on help to members of Congress in their election situations. It is quite a point, especially with those difficult elections coming around next year.

Peace in the Far East? The Kremlin seems to want to make peace in Korea, Far Eastern experts in Washington now believe. It is thought that Malenkov may well make concessions — and with no danger of suffering loss of prestige in the Politburo where his position still could be challenged. For, even if he yields to some Western demands on Korea, he can point to a brilliant success elsewhere in the Far East — in Burma.

The signal victory of the Kremlin in Burma recently has gone virtually unnoticed in the press. Within the past two weeks, Burma — by this time a pro-Communist state — has shown that it now has joined the Moscow-Peiping Axis, by taking the following steps: (1) conclusion of a trade pact with Red China; (2) refusal to accept any economic assistance from the United States; and (3) an appeal to the United Nations to condemn National China as an aggressor because of the presence on Burmese soil of a small force of Nationalist Chinese troops.

The real objective of Soviet aggression in the Far East — most experts agree — is hegemony over Southern Asia, so as to deny to Western lands rubber, tin and other valuable strategic materials. Burma stands right in the center of this area and is one of two surplus rice bowls there (Siam is the other). Both nearby India and Malaya are largely dependent on Burma for rice, the basic foodstuff in the East. A Communist-controlled Burma could disrupt those countries by denying their supplies of rice.

Thus, the new Russian Czar can boast that he has breached the main objective of Soviet policy, whatever he may concede on Korea.

Velde: The clique of leftish clergymen who have been assailing Congressman Velde for his alleged threat to investigate clergymen received a severe blow from Dr. Daniel Poling, prominent Baptist minister and editor of the *Christian Herald*. The Rev. Poling in a sermon on March 22 said: "I think that the clergymen of all faiths should be investigated, just as I think that certain educators should be investigated, because there are false prophets among us."

Velde denied that he ever proposed what Dr. Poling wanted, and thereby found himself chided by the grass roots for not pushing such an investigation. The Omaha *World Herald* in an editorial, said: "We see no reason for the uproar. The fact is that some church groups have served the Communist cause, and churchmen themselves know it. . . . Why Mr. Velde should take such a beating for saying what every informed person knows is true, is something of a mystery. He should have stuck to his guns." Velde's office reports that its mail is swamped with requests from clergymen of all denominations urging the Congressman to investigate men of the cloth.

States' Rights and Labor: Capitol Hill is discussing a surprising and revolutionary proposal put before the House and Senate Labor committees last week by Mr. John W. Cummiskey, a Michigan attorney specializing in labor law. It is surprising because it voiced the thoughts of more than one member of Congress who has hesitated to take such a strong stand. It is revolutionary because it advocates repeal of the Wagner Act, most of the Taft-Hartley Act and the return of legislative power over labor back to the States. It introduces the principle of states' rights as guiding law in the matter of labor.

"Through what I believe", said Mr. Cummisky, "is administrative misinterpretation and mishandling, the Taft-Hartley law has been twisted and distorted until in many respects any relationship between Congressional intent stated in the original statute as it was passed and the present operation under that law is purely coincidental." Mr. Cummiskey stresses that the real problem is "big union against small employer" — the monopolistic power of Big Unionism; and advocates that the Norris-LaGuardia Act and other legislation which protects unions in monopolistic practices should be amended to permit the injunctive process to be used.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Michigan attorney believes that states should have sole power to legislate on labor matters, reserving for the Federal Government only legislation involving national emergencies and control of monopolistic practices. "I submit", said Cummiskey, "that unions today as well as business should be subjected to necessary controls under the Federal anti-trust laws." (For copies of the attorney's statement write to Mr. John W. Cummiskey, 900 Michigan Trust Bldg., Grand Rapids 2, Mich.)

At the Senate Labor Committee hearings, Senator Taft displayed unusual interest in the proposals. The Ohioan said that, although there seem to be too many legislative difficulties at present for Congress to follow all of the Cummiskey suggestions, Congress should try to restore as much power as possible over labor to the states. And the Senator proposed that a commission be appointed to explore the possibilities of carrying out Cummiskey's ideas.

With Your Money: Wall Street is puzzled by the purchase of the Willys-Overland Motors, Inc., by the Kaiser-Frazer Corporation, recently reported. How could a company that has shown losses for all but two years since 1945 buy a company that has been showing a profit? The questioners also have in mind the fact that K-F still owes the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the little sum of $48,417,000.

The key to the puzzle is an "asset" created by our tax laws. Because of its losses, K-F has acquired a tax-claim against the United States Treasury — under the carry-back provisions of the income tax law — of $31,200,000. This claim is good for four or five years to come. Willys, on the other hand, has been operating profitably, even though it shows a net of only two per cent on its sales during the last three years; the Treasury has taken the rest of its earnings. Since the tax-claim of K-F can be transferred to the combination, the tax collector will get less of the profits that Willys is expected to bring to it. Thus, a company whose efficiency is measured by its losses can acquire a saleable "asset", and the bankers who supplied the new working capital needed by the combination no doubt took this into consideration.

The transaction becomes all the more interesting when we recall that K-F was shored up with the taxpayers' money. Under the law, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation can make a loan only when the applicant shows proof that no private financial institution will do so. The vast loans made to K-F is *prima facie* evidence of the company's shortcomings, and its record of losses proves either its inefficiency or buyer's tepid interest in its product. The law of the market place ruled against the company, while the law of the land ruled in its favor.

The life of RFC expires under the law next year. Congress should let it die.

Revolt Against Federal Aid to Education: The Hoosier rebellion to stop federalized control of education is spreading. According to the *Los Angeles Times*, February 20, the Indiana upsurge is being taken as a model in California and Mrs. John J. Phillips of Moorpark, California, is one of the leaders in "the movement to achieve reform in this state along the line already worked out in Indiana. . . . More than 1,000,000 parents in the California PTA are involved in the policy upheaval."

This grass-roots movement is much more deep-seated and involved than we reported in our piece "Education Front" in our issue of March 18. We reported incorrectly that the Indiana Parent-Teachers Association itself was opposing Federal Aid to Education. Actually, it is an organization formed by PTA members, entitled "Indiana PTA Members' Study Group on Federal Aid to Education", Mrs. F. S. Ballweg, Secretary, (P.O. Box 7027, Station A, Indianapolis, Ind.), which has revolted against the state PTA organization. The latter, without their knowledge and consent had committed the local members to support of federal aid to education. This revolt which started over a year ago spread so rapidly that the state convention of the PTA had to change the by-laws so that future legislative stands, both state and national, were required to be referred to local units for vote.

The *Indianapolis Star* says this upsurge "was strictly a rebellion against Federal encroachment on the public school system. It was a grass-roots rebellion, a sequel to the seething struggle last year that broke the grip of the Federal Government on the welfare program in Indiana. [See our pieces on the Jenner Amendment.] And like the welfare fight, the educational upheaval promises to become national in scope."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Ultimate Weapon by Oleg Animisov. Preface by General William Donovan. Chicago: The Henry Regnery Company. $3.50. Reviewed by Freda Utley.

The Senators who voted for the confirmation of Bohlen as our Ambassador to Russia might have changed their minds if they had read this book. For, as its author eloquently demonstrates, if we are to win the Cold War, "every Soviet citizen must be told and know that even if Stalin should seek a compromise with the West, the free world would not buy security at the price of his freedom". And the Russians, Poles and other people under the Kremlin's iron heel, are unlikely to be convinced that we shall not betray them again, when we send a man to Moscow who still today defends the Yalta agreement as having been necessary to "win the war".

In forcing through the Bohlen appointment, the Administration was helping to destroy the possibility that the Soviet regime will eventually "fall of its own weight", although this is the hope on which the Administration policies appear to be based. Obviously the Soviet Empire will not disintegrate unless its subjects revolt or the Red Army turns against its masters. But as Animisov shows, the revolutionary forces are not only held in check by terror, and "the ideological and organizational pervasiveness of the Soviet state apparatus". They also lack confidence in the West thanks to our past behavior. "How on earth", one Soviet escapee said to him, "could I have confidence in people who openly admitted that the Kremlin defied them and enslaved other nations contrary to agreements to which America was a party?"

Oleg Animisov is a Russian born Latvian who was in Riga when the Red Army occupied his country in 1940. Later he travelled all over German-occupied Russia as an interpreter for the German Economic Inspection, and had contact with General Vlassov's "Russian Liberation Movement". Thus he is one of the very few first-hand witnesses among us who saw just how the Germans "lost the Battle of Russia by turning millions of potential allies into implacable enemies". This alone gives his book unique interest.

But his main concern is to make us understand the Russian mind and attitude so that we shall cease making mistakes almost as grave as those made by the Germans. He shows that it was not simply cruelty or the economic necessities of war that alienated the Russian population which had at first welcomed the Germans as liberators. He relates, for instance, how a Russian peasant woman said to him: "We all understand that the Germans are fighting a war and that they need foodstuffs. We understand their taking away our grain reserves, since they have to feed their army. But if they fight Communism and not our people why don't they treat us as equals?"

The "ultimate weapon" is psychological warfare. The author of the book so named shows that the kind we now practice is worse than useless since it ignores the aspirations of the Soviet peoples, insults their intelligence and arouses their fears that we shall conclude "super Teherans, Yaltas and Potsdams". The Russian Common Man, he says, is neither an impractical dreamer nor a mindless robot, but a "thorough realist". He has learnt to judge others by their deeds and to disregard propaganda. And he is still "waiting to find out whether America is 'the fighting champion of human rights for all' or just another 'selfish great power with no genuine concern for their suffering'." His fears that the second alternative is true are naturally aroused by statements such as that made by President Eisenhower and the Voice of America that we are ready to go "at least half way" in seeking a compromise with the Communist tyrants.

Entered as second class matter at the Post Office, Washington, D. C. Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. Trial Subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $5.50. One year, $10. Two years, $18. First class mail, one year, $11.00; six months, $6.00. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) one year, $12.00; foreign (regular mail) one year, $11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscription or change of address to become effective.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED